CORRECTED COPY

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 19 1981
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

80-1213

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1980

EILEEN ELDORADO JOHNSON,

Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

SAMUEL W. TUCKER
HILL, TUCKER & MARSH
P.O. Box 27363
Richmond, Virginia 23261
(804) 648-9073

J. HUGO MADISON
1610 United Virginia Bank Building
Norfolk, Virginia 23510
(804) 627-5215

Attorneys for Petitioner

4525 LUTZ APPELLATE PRINTERS, INC.
Law and Financial Printing
South River, N.J. (201) 257-6850 | New York, N.Y. (212) 840-9494 | Philadelphia, Pa. (215) 563-5587 | Washington, D.C. (202) 783-7288

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does the second sentence of Rule 404(b), Federal Rules of Evidence, license the prosecutor to offset the petitioner's showing of her good general reputation, by eliciting from the government's rebuttal witness hearsay insinuations of specific dishonest and unlawful acts not charged in the indictment?

2. On her trial pursuant to indictment charging willful understatements of her taxable income, was the petitioner-physician denied due process when the district judge instructed the jurors that *they* were to determine whether she had filed fraudulent claims for Medicaid as the government's rebuttal character witness had insinuated?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Questions Presented i

Table of Contents ii

Table of Citations iii

Opinion Below 1

Jurisdiction 2

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved 2

Statement of the Case 3

Statement of Facts 5

The Basis For Federal Jurisdiction in the Court of First Instance 6

Reasons For Granting the Writ:

I. The opinion of the majority below is in conflict with the rule which it cites and with other decisions of that court and other courts of appeals. 6

II. By overlooking the underlying facts and a pertinent ruling of the trial judge, the majority avoided the constitutional problems in this case. 12

Conclusion 14

Contents

Page

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Cases Cited:

Boyd v. United States, 142 U.S. 450 (1892) 13

Eley v. United States, 117 F. 2d 526 (6th Cir. 1941) 7

Fay v. Noia, 372 U.S. 391 (1963) 14

Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458 (1938) 13, 14

Lane v. Warden, Maryland Penitentiary, 320 F. 2d 179 (4th Cir. 1963) 13

Lovely v. United States, 169 F. 2d 386 (4th Cir. 1948) ... 13

United States v. Benedetto, 571 F. 2d 1246 (2nd Cir. 1978) . 8, 9

United States v. Curry, 512 F. 2d 1299 (4th Cir. 1975), cert. denied, 423 U.S. 832 8

United States v. Davenport, 449 F. 2d 696 (5th Cir. 1971) . 7, 8

United States v. Reese, 568 F. 2d 1246 (6th Cir. 1977) ... 9

Statutes Cited:

18 U.S.C. §3231 6

26 U.S.C. §7201 .....3, 6, 12

Contents

Page

28 U.S.C. 1254(1) 2

42 U.S.C. §1396h 13

United States Constitution Cited:

Fifth Amendment 2

Sixth Amendment 2, 13

Rules Cited:

Federal Rules of Evidence:

Rule 404(b) ..... i, 2, 6, 7, 10, 11

Rule 405(b) 10

APPENDIX

Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals 1a

Order of the United States Court of Appeals Dated December 17, 1980 ..... 8a

No. 80-

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1980

EILEEN ELDORADO JOHNSON,

Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

Petitioner prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit entered in the above entitled case on November 12, 1980.

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit will be published, ____ F. 2d ____, and is set out in the Appendix, 1a-7a.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is dated and was entered on November 12, 1980. The order of that court denying rehearing is dated December 17, 1980. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The case involves the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which, in pertinent part, provides:

> "No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . ."

Although not specifically said below, the rights of the petitioner asserted at every stage of this case have the further protection of the Sixth Amendment, *viz.*:

> "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a . . . trial . . . by an impartial jury . . . and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; [and] to be confronted with the witnesses against him . . .".

This case also involves Rule 404(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence which provides as follows:

> "Rule 404. Character Evidence Not Admissible To Prove Conduct; Exceptions; Other Crimes.
>
> * * *

(b) Other crimes, wrongs, or acts. Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show that he acted in conformity therewith. It may, however, be admissible for other purposes, such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The indictment, in three counts, charged that the petitioner had willfully and knowingly attempted to evade and defeat a large part of the income tax due by her to the United States by reporting a taxable income of $-0- instead of $9,017.99 for the year 1972, and a taxable income of $-0- instead of $31,336.16 for the year 1973 and a taxable income of $11,980.25 instead of $29,274.71 for the year 1974, all in violation of Title 26, United States Code, §7201.

The case was tried by a jury in Lynchburg, Virginia between May 29 and June 6, 1979. After the government had rested its case in chief and the petitioner and her witnesses, including seven character witnesses, had testified and rested, the government, in rebuttal, called one Robert Henry Pemberton, an employee at H.E.W. Audit Agency in Richmond, Virginia as a "character witness" (V-T234).[1]

Mr. Pemberton testified that he made a review of Dr. Johnson's (the petitioner's) medical services for the period February 1976 through January 1979 (V-T237) to identify potential for fraud in the Medicaid program (V-T234). He found that the petitioner billed for four times as many services per

1. "V-T" refers to pages of Volume V (and "VI-T" to Volume VI) of the Transcript of Testimony.

patient as other physicians in the state and that she had billed for medical services which were not recorded on her patients' charts; (V-T237-240) and he had been told by some of her patients that they had not received services for which Dr. Johnson had billed (V-T238). Based on his review, he concluded that the truthfulness of the petitioner was questionable.

Defense counsel objected to the study as not being rebuttal of anything previously shown and objected to the witness' testifying to what he had learned from others (V-T234-5). The petitioner again testified, in attempted refutation of Pemberton's testimony (VI-T3, *et seq.*). On cross-examination, she was asked: "Who would have received the benefit then of all the fraudulent forms for Medicaid that were filed?" Counsel for the petitioner objected to the question and made a motion for a mistrial (VI-T8). The motion was overruled (VI-T11). Subsequently, counsel for the defense moved for a new trial, arguing that the petitioner had been prejudiced by the testimony of Pemberton (VIII-T21).

The jury convicted on all counts and the court sentenced the petitioner to pay a fine of $8,000 on each of the three counts, suspended execution of all but $3,500 of the fine, and suspended the imposition of any sentence of imprisonment, placing the petitioner on probation for 2 years. In an opinion by Judge Phillips in which Judge Russell concurred, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit affirmed the judgment of conviction on November 12, 1980, Judge Widener dissenting. Petition for rehearing suggesting rehearing *en banc* was denied on December 17, 1980.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The petitioner has been engaged in the general practice of medicine in Lynchburg, Virginia since 1967. Upon the death of her brother in 1971, she "inherited" the practice which he had commenced many years before she joined him in Lynchburg. She filed tax returns for 1972, 1973 and 1974, which understated her income by approximately $120,000 and her tax liability by $31,000.

The petitioner testified that records of her income were kept by her office help, that she never had anything to do with the money and had "never had any occasion to hide any". (V-T125-129, 138-9). The entries of receipts for medical services were made by her employees and she did not check behind them. "When it was time to prepare the income return Mrs. Allar kept the figures and we prepared it together and she would tell me what headings to put, and that's how it was done at the last minute." (V-T147-8). From such memoranda, the tax returns were prepared by a professional who would tell the petitioner where she should sign the return and what tax she owed. She would write a check for what she was informed was her tax liability. The petitioner testified that she did not know how to prepare an income tax return, that she had never attempted to prepare one and that she had no idea how much money she was making (V-T145-149, 152, 167-168).

The petitioner showed that it was difficult for her to employ competent clerical help. In 1976 she engaged another accountant to set up for her a bookkeeping system and to instruct her employee, Mrs. Allar, how the accounts should be kept. That accountant testified to Mrs. Allar's inaptness in keeping the accounts even after he had set up and explained the simplified system for doing so (V-T190-198).

Seven witnesses, including professional colleagues, testified that the petitioner was reputed to be a law abiding citizen and had a good reputation for truth and veracity (V-T96-117, 231-2); and one of them testified to the difficulty in obtaining competent clerical help (V-T117).

THE BASIS FOR FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

The indictment having charged offenses against the laws of the United States (Title 26 U.S.C. §7201), the district court had jurisdiction pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. §3231.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I.

The opinion of the majority below is in conflict with the rule which it cites and with other decisions of that court and other courts of appeals.

The majority below seems to have perceived that the government's attorneys had a duty "to rebut evidence [of good general reputation] designed to plant in the jury's mind a reasonable doubt that [the defendant] could have possessed the culpability of mind requisite to convict of the crime charged", even though such evidence was unquestionably true. The majority suggests that because, in this case, the petitioner's evidence of her good reputation *was* unassailable in any of the conventional and ordinarily permissible ways, the government was justified in doing exactly what is forbidden by the first sentence of Rule 404(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence and by the case law in that circuit and in other circuits, *viz.*:

> "Rule 404. Character Evidence Not Admissible To Prove Conduct; Exceptions; Other Crimes.
>
> * * *
>
> (b) Other crimes, wrongs or acts. Evidence of other crimes, wrongs or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show that he acted in conformity therewith. . . ."

In *Eley v. United States,* 117 F. 2d 526 (6th Cir. 1941) the same principle was thus stated:

> "It is a rule long settled by both state and federal decisions that proof of good reputation for particular traits of character may be met only by proof of reputation that such characteristics are not possessed, and is not to be traversed by a showing of specific acts which might denote bad character if established, or create a bad reputation if within general public knowledge. Reuben v. United States, 7 Cir., 86 F. 2d 464." (117 F. 2d at 528).

In *United States v. Davenport,* 449 F. 2d 696 (5th Cir. 1971) this exposition was given:

> "The only type of evidence admissible to show defendant's character is proof of his reputation in the community. Steinberg v. United States, 5th Cir. 1947, 162 F. 2d 120. Specific acts of misconduct cannot be shown. Michelson v. United States, 335 U.S. 469, 69 S. Ct. 213, 93 L. Ed. 168 (1948); French v. United States, 5th Cir. 1956, 232 F. 2d 736. If the defendant offers

> evidence of his reputation for good character, the government may rebut by evidence that his reputation is bad. Michelson v. United States, *supra.* This evidence, however, is limited to testimony concerning reputation only. Proof of specific acts of misconduct is still not admissible. Curtis Publishing Co. v. Butts, 5th Cir. 1965, 351 F.2d 702; United States v. Beno, 2d Cir. 1963, 324 F. 2d 582; McCormick, Evidence §158, at 337 (1954)." (449 F. 2d at 699).

In *United States v. Curry*, 512 F. 2d 1299 (4th Cir. 1975), *cert. denied*, 423 U.S. 832, the court below reversed a conviction because the government's rebuttal witness testified:

> "About a year ago I had information he was dealing in drugs."

There, the court said: "[T]he prosecution is not permitted to elicit testimony from its own rebuttal witnesses concerning *specific traits* of the defendant for the sole purpose of repudiating the defendant's evidence of his *general reputation.*" (512 F. 2d at 1305; emphasis by the court).

The promulgation of the Federal Rules of Evidence did not effect a change in the law as it had been variously stated. In *United States v. Benedetto*, 571 F. 2d 1246, 1249-50 (2nd Cir. 1978) the court gave this discussion:

> "However, character evidence has long been admissible only in the form of reputation and not in the form of a recitation of good or bad acts. See *Michelson v. United States*, 335 U.S. 469, 477, 69 S. Ct. 213, 93 L. Ed. 168 (1948); Fed. R. Evid. 405(a).[5] Furthermore, while a character

> witness may be asked on *cross-examination* about 'specific instances of conduct,' such acts may not be proved by extrinsic evidence of the sort offered here. That the defense improperly attempted to establish defendant's good character by reference to specific good acts did not justify the prosecution's use of testimony concerning bad acts either in its direct case or in rebuttal. See *United States v. Beno*, 324 F. 2d 582 (2d Cir. 1963), aff'd after remand, 333 F. 2d 669 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 379 U.S. 880, 85 S. Ct. 147, 13 L. Ed. 2d 86 (1964)." (Footnote omitted.) (Emphasis by the court.)

And, further commenting on the Federal Rules of Evidence, the court in the *Benedetto* case said, at footnote 5:

> "5. It should be noted that the new Federal Rules of Evidence, also allow character testimony in the form of opinion. Fed. R. Evid. 405 and 608. The general prohibition against direct testimony about specific acts is continued. See id. Furthermore, the exception for testimony about specific acts in Rule 405(b) is inapplicable here, since appellant's character was not 'an essential element of [the] charge . . . .' Fed. R. Evid. 405(b). See *United States v. Kahan*, 479 F. 2d 290, 293 (2d Cir. 1973), rev'd on other grounds, 415 U.S. 239, 94 S. Ct. 1179, 39 L. Ed. 2d 297 (1974) (evidence of prior performance of official duty without bribe-taking inadmissible in bribery prosecution)."

In *United States v. Reese*, 568 F. 2d 1246, 1250 (6th Cir. 1977), the court took the occasion again to point to the rule cited by the court below as authority that —

> "Evidence of other crimes, wrongs or acts is not admissible on the issue of the character of the accused or the criminal propensity of the accused in order to show that he acted in conformity therewith. Fed. R. Evid. 404(b); . . ."

In its brief in the court below, the government argued that "Mr. Pemberton's testimony was proper pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 405(b), which allows specific instances of conduct to be admitted as rebuttal when specific character traits are essential elements of the charge or defense" and that "the specific trait of 'honesty' was an integral part of her defense and was clearly placed before the jury by the six character witnesses and by Dr. Johnson's own testimony."

One difficulty with that argument was that the government's hearsay reports alleging specific dishonest acts did not constitute the "proof" that Fed. R. Evid. 405(b) permits. In each of the illustrative cases cited by the government, the specific instance of wrongdoing had been fully and competently established. In the case at bar, the damaging suggestion of dishonesty was Pemberton's (hearsay) assertion that unnamed patients of the petitioner had told him they did not receive services for which she had billed Medicaid.

The court below side-stepped these arguments and based affirmance solely on the second sentence of Rule 404(b) which the government's brief had not mentioned.

The second sentence of Rule 404(b) permits evidence of other crimes, wrongs or acts "for other purposes, such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident." Labeling Pemberton's suggestions of Medicaid fraud as evidence of the

petitioner's "state of mind"[2] and not as evidence of other crimes, wrongs or acts offered to show the petitioner's character, the court below ingeniously held that the testimony was admissible for a purpose other than the proof of character which Rule 404(b) proscribes. We submit that the resulting conflict with the inhibitory first sentence of Rule 404(b) is made no less violent by the court's unrealistic reference to "character" or to the character trait of dishonesty as "state of mind", and that this Court should not permit the departure, in this case, from the rule of evidence which has long been followed in the court below, and in other circuits as well, and which has been clearly stated in the Federal Rules of Evidence.

An accused has a time-honored right to submit in his defense his good general reputation. It was not the intent of the Federal Rules of Evidence to chill the exercise of that right by requiring the accused to be prepared to defend against every possible suggestion of his wrongdoing at any time in his life.

---

2. In some criminal prosecutions, the defendant's state of mind at the time of the forbidden act may be material; but proof of his state of mind on some other occasion would not be relevant.

II.

By overlooking the underlying facts and a pertinent ruling of the trial judge, the majority avoided the constitutional problems in this case.

The indictments charged income tax evasion in violation of 26 U.S.C. §7201. To rebut the petitioner's showing of her good general reputation, the government called its witness Pemberton who testified as follows:

> "Dr. Johnson's . . . patient medical charts . . . showed that [she] had billed for medical services which were not in the chart. In talking with recipients who had received services it also showed that the medical charts substantiated services that the recipients alleged not to have received." (V-T237).
>
> "Dr. Johnson had billed for and signed Medicaid claims for services that were not documented in the medical chart. And if I may, I would like to clarify, as a requirement of Medicaid any services that are billed must be substantiated in the medical chart, or those funds are reimbursable to the Federal Government.
>
> THE COURT:
>
> Q. And then you checked with some of the patients? A. Yes, sir.
>
> Q. And found out that the services were not rendered? A. In talking with the recipients they stated they had not received certain services which were billed by Dr. Johnson." (V-T238).

The thrust of Pemberton's testimony was that his investigations and inquiries indicated the petitioner's commission of Medicaid fraud (a violation of 42 U.S.C. §1396h). The court's "cautionary" action or instruction to the jury was "whether or not fraudulent claims had been filed for Medicare would be up to you to determine . . ." (VI-T11). Nothing in the opinion of the majority refers to either of the foregoing quotations from the record. The court's "finding no merit in the defendant's other contentions" neatly sweeps them under the rug.

The government's introduction of evidence tending to show the petitioner's guilt of crimes other than those charged in the indictments was a deliberate violation of the petitioner's due process right "to be tried upon competent evidence, and only for the offense charged." *Boyd v. United States,* 142 U.S. 450, 458 (1892); *Lovely v. United States,* 169 F. 2d 386 (4th Cir. 1948); *see Lane v. Warden, Maryland Penitentiary,* 320 F. 2d 179 (4th Cir. 1963).

Moreover, Pemberton's accusations, being unrelated to the charges in the indictment, were in violation of the petitioner's Sixth Amendment right "to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation" and, insofar as he related what he had been told by some unnamed patients, his testimony violated the petitioner's Sixth Amendment right "to be confronted with the witnesses against [her]." In fact, a purpose and effect of all of Pemberton's testimony was to deprive the petitioner of her Sixth Amendment right to "trial by an impartial jury." *Cf., Lane v. Warden Maryland Penitentiary, supra,* where "the reading to the jury, at the commencement of Lane's trial, of that portion of the indictments relating to his prior convictions destroyed the impartiality of the jury and denied him due process of law." (320 F. 2d at 179).

The petitioner did not knowingly and intelligently waive these rights which were personal to her [*Johnson v. Zerbst,* 304

U.S. 458, 464 (1938); *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 439 (1963)]; and she specially claimed in the court of appeals her right to due process of law.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for writ of certiorari should be granted and the decision of the court below reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. TUCKER
HILL, TUCKER & MARSH
P.O. Box 27363
Richmond, Virginia 23261

J. HUGO MADISON
1610 United Virginia
Bank Building
Norfolk, Virginia 23510

Attorneys for Petitioner

APPENDIX

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 79-5272

United States of America,

Appellee,

versus

Eileen Eldorado Johnson,

Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Lynchburg. James C. Turk, District Judge.

Argued August 19, 1980. Decided November 12, 1980

Before RUSSELL, WIDENER and PHILLIPS, Circuit Judges.

S.W. Tucker (Hill, Tucker & Marsh; J. Hugo Madison on brief) for Appellant; John S. Edwards, Assistant United States Attorney (Faye S. Ehrenstamm, Assistant United States Attorney on brief) for Appellee.

Opinion

PHILLIPS, Circuit Judge:

Convicted by a jury of federal income tax evasion under 26 U.S.C.A. §7201, Eileen Eldorado Johnson unsuccessfully moved in the district court for a new trial, on the grounds that evidence of her overstated Medicaid billings was improperly admitted and that government counsel's reference to her "fraudulent" Medicaid forms unduly prejudiced the jury. We affirm, holding that the extrinsic acts evidence was properly admitted under Fed. R. Evid. 404(b) and that no prejudice resulted from the "fraudulent" reference in view of the trial court's corrective action.

I

Johnson is a medical doctor, who inherited her practice from her deceased brother. She filed tax returns for 1972, 1973, and 1974, which understated her income by approximately $120,000.00 and her tax liability by approximately $31,000.00. Her defense at trial was inadvertence: she had had nothing to do with preparing her tax returns because she cared nothing for money and chose, instead, to devote her time to the demanding personal needs of her patients. To support this defense she produced seven local witnesses — three physicians, a school board member, a public school teacher, a mortician, and a minister — who testified to her truthfulness, honesty, and compassion, and to the busy nature of her practice.

In attempted rebuttal of this portrait of Johnson as an altruistic healer of the sick, whose concerns lay elsewhere than attending to her financial interests and resulting legal responsibilities, the government called Robert Pemberton, an auditor for the U.S. Department of Health, Education &

Welfare. Pemberton testified at length about his investigation of Johnson's billings for Medicaid services for 1976-78. His study showed that Johnson reported four times as many services per patient as other Virginia doctors. Johnson did not object to the general course of Pemberton's testimony. In fact, the following day Johnson again took the stand in order to testify that she had not signed the Medicaid billings upon which Pemberton had based his investigation. During cross-examination, government counsel asked Johnson, "Who would have received the benefit of all the fraudulent forms for Medicaid that were filed?" Johnson's counsel objected and moved for a mistrial because use of the term, "fraudulent," unduly prejudiced the jury. The trial judge overruled the motion, directed government counsel to rephrase the question, and gave the jury a cautionary instruction.

II

We hold that Pemberton's testimony was admissible under Fed. R. Evid. 404(b), which provides:

> Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show that he acted in conformity therewith. It may, however, be admissible for other purposes, such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident.

The first sentence of Rule 404(b) brings forward the traditional rule that extrinsic acts evidence is inadmissible solely to prove that defendant is a bad character and, therefore, likely to have committed the crime charged. *See, e.g., Michelson v. United States*, 335 U.S. 469 (1948); *United States v. Woods*, 484

F.2d 127 (4th Cir. 1973); *Lovely v. United States*, 169 F.2d 386 (4th Cir. 1948); Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Evid. 404(b); McCormick, *Evidence* §190, at 447 (2d ed. 1972). Extrinsic acts evidence, however, may be admissible for other purposes including those listed in Rule 404(b). The Rule's list is merely illustrative, not exclusive, Wright & Graham, *Federal Practice and Procedure: Evidence* §5240, at 469 (1978).

Rule 404(b) of course commits to trial judge discretion the determination whether extrinsic act evidence shall be admitted under its second sentence. In exercising that discretion the judge first must determine if the proffered evidence is relevant to an issue other than the accused's character. If so, then the trial judge must balance the evidence's probative value against the dangers of undue prejudice aroused by this form of evidence. This may concededly pose particularly difficult problems. The Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 404(b) state:

> No mechanical solution is offered. The determination must be made whether the danger of undue prejudice outweighs the probative value of the availability of other means of proof and other factors appropriate for making decisions of this kind under Rule 403 [confusion of issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, waste of time, and needless presentation of cumulative evidence].

Within this general guideline for the exercise of trial court discretion, we think the evidence here challenged was properly admitted. The general prohibition contained in the first sentence of Rule 404(b) is designed to prevent prosecutorial overreaching by a means whose obvious effectiveness has made it an

inescapable temptation for advocates over the years. The second sentence however reflects the perception that evidence of "other . . . acts" may sometimes be critical to proof on a dispositive issue related to a defendant's state of mind. The ambivalence reflected in the Rule but serves to emphasize the particular delicacy of the discretionary rulings its administration may require. There is no gainsaying that the ruling here posed just such a problem for the trial judge, but we think he properly resolved it.

Particularly where, as here, a defendant in a criminal case by her own testimony and that of others has deliberately sought as the primary means of defense to depict herself as one whose essential philosophy and habitual conduct in life is completely at odds with the possession of a state of mind requisite to guilt of the offense charged, that defendant may be considered in effect to have forfeited any protection that the first sentence of the Rule might otherwise have provided against the type of "other act" evidence here challenged. *See Walder v. United States*, 347 U.S. 62 (1954). In such circumstances, testimony such as that of Pemberton may well be the only effective way to rebut evidence designed generally to plant in the jury's mind a reasonable doubt that such a person could have possessed the culpability of mind requisite to convict of the crime charged. Balancing the probative value of the challenged evidence against its potential for unfairly prejudicing the defendant, and on the latter point taking into account that the defendant deliberately chose to base her defense upon evidence not otherwise effectively rebuttable, we conclude that the district judge's admission of Pemberton's evidence lay well within the bounds of the discretion reposed in him.

III

We think that government counsel's unfortunate reference to "fraudulent" medicaid forms was sufficiently corrected by the trial judge's cautionary actions so that the risk of prejudice was adequately removed.

Finding no merit in the defendant's other contentions, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.

WIDENER, Circuit Judge, dissenting:

I respectfully dissent and would grant a new trial.

Assuming that the evidence of other acts is admissible for one purpose or another, and I think, after *United States v. Woods*, 484 F2d 127 (4th Cir. 1973), even taking into consideration the later advent of the new rules, the admissibility of such evidence is pretty well entrusted in this circuit to the almost uncontrolled discretion of the trial judge, Pemberton's most damning testimony is not considered by the majority in its opinion.

Pemberton testified that Dr. Johnson had billed for specific services not rendered, and he ascertained that fact by asking the patients involved. Thus, the false billing he concluded Dr. Johnson had done was proved by statements other than those made by the declarant while testifying at a trial or hearing and offered in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted. This is hearsay pure and simple under FRE 801(c) and inadmissible under FRE 802, for it is not subject to any exception as to which I am advised.

An example follows:

"THE COURT:

Q. And then you checked with some of the patients?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And found out that the services were not rendered?

A. In talking with the recipients, they stated that they had not received certain services which were billed by Dr. Johnson."

Specific instances of conduct, whether offered to rebut a defense to the merits, as the majority treats it, or whether offered to rebut a defense of good character, I think may no more be proved by hearsay than any other essential fact in the case.

The testimony I have quoted is only a part of that introduced; other evidence is equally as inadmissible. It may only be considered highly prejudicial, and its admission should warrant a new trial.

ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS DATED DECEMBER 17, 1980

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 79-5272

United States of America,

Appellee,

versus

Eileen Eldorado Johnson,

Appellant.

Upon consideration of the appellant's petition for rehearing and suggestion for rehearing en banc, and no judge having requested a poll on the suggestion for rehearing en banc,

It is ADJUDGED and ORDERED that the petition for rehearing is denied.

Entered at the direction of Judge Phillips with the concurrence of Judge Russell. Judge Widener dissents. He would grant rehearing and a new trial for the reasons expressed in his dissenting opinion.

For the Court,

s/ William K. Slate, II
CLERK

Filed
Dec. 17, 1980